

## REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Hence, Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

### REJECTION OF CLAIM 1 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the method is computer-implemented and therefore is clearly statutory subject matter. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 and 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by “EAST”, User’s Manual for the Examiner’s Automated Search Tool (hereinafter EAST). However, EAST fails to disclose or suggest in any way various features of Claims 1 and 14.

Specifically, Claims 1 and 14 require “detecting input indicating the selection of a second criteria.” The Office Action has correlated this feature to checking check boxes (see item 50 in Figure 9.2, as labeled by the Office Action). In item 50, the check marks have been placed by the user to select which items satisfy a criteria. The user’s act of checking a box is actually not selecting a criteria, but selecting an *item*. Apparently, the Office Action has equated selection of a criteria with selection of an item. However, the difference between the two actions is important. Since the items of the cited art must be selected item by item, and since user intervention is required for each check mark, the prior art method requires repeated mental steps. The human user must repeatedly think through the mental steps of selecting which boxes to check.

Since EAST fails to disclose or suggest in any way these aspects of Claims 1 and 14, these claims are patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

#### REJECTION OF CLAIMS 11 and 24 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 11 and 24 require “generating one or more second page elements that enable the browser to receive user input indicating a selection of one or more criteria of a plurality of criteria.” For reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claims 1 and 14, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest in any way “user input indicating a selection of one or more criteria of a plurality of criteria.” In addition, Claims 11 and 24 are also patentable because they contain the limitation of “second” and “third” page elements. Specifically, Claims 11 and 24 require “generating one or more second page elements that enable the browser to receive user input indicating a selection of . . . criteria” and “generating third page elements that cause the browser to display . . . a visual indication of how said plurality of items satisfy said particular criterion . . .” In Claims 11 and 14 the page elements for receiving user input for selecting criteria are separate from the page elements for displaying indications of which items satisfy the criteria. In the cited art, the page elements allegedly for receiving user input for selecting criteria are *inseparable* from the page elements allegedly for displaying indications of which items satisfy the criteria. Thus, the cited art cannot possibly have a “second” page element for receiving user input, and then a “third” page element for displaying indications.

Since EAST fails to disclose or suggest in any way these aspects of Claims 11 and 24, these claims are patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-10, 12, 13, 15-23, 25 and 26 are dependent claims, each of which depends (directly or indirectly) on the claims discussed above. Each of Claims 2-10, 12, 13, 15-23, 25 and 26 is therefore allowable for the reasons given above for the claim on which it depends. In addition, each of Claims 2-10, 12, 13, 15-23, 25 and 26 introduces one or more additional limitations that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time. The Applicant reserves the right to further point out the differences between the cited art and the novel features recited in the dependent claims.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP



Marcel K. Bingham  
Reg. No. 42,327

Dated: July 1, 2005


2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, CA 95110  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext.206  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on July 1, 2005

by

  
Jennifer Newell